

REMARKS

Claims 1 and 3-11 remain pending in the present application. Claim 2 has been cancelled. Claim 1 has been amended. Basis for the amendments can be found throughout the specification, claims and drawings as originally filed.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1, 6, 7 and 9-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Kun (U.S. Pat. No. 3,757,856). Claims 2-5 and 8 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. The Office Action Summary indicated that Claims 2-5 and 8 were objected to but paragraph 3 on page 2 indicated that Claims 3-5 and 8 were objected to. In a telephone conversation with the Examiner regarding this inconsistency, the Examiner stated that Claims 2-5 and 8 were objected to and that paragraph 3 on page 2 had a typographical error.

Claim 1 has been amended to include the limitations of Claim 2 and Claim 2 has been cancelled. Thus, Applicants believe Claim 1, as amended, patentably distinguishes over the art of record. Likewise, Claims 6, 7 and 9-11, which ultimately depend from Claim 1, are also believed to patentably distinguish over the art of record. Reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

ALLOWABLE SUBJECT MATTER


Claims 2-5 and 8 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. The limitations of Claim 2 have been added to Claim 1 as discussed above. Claims 3-5 and 8 depend from amended Claim 1.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: August 17, 2004

By: 
Michael J. Schmidt, 34,007

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

MJS/pmg